arXiv:math/0701240v3 [math.NT] 6 Dec 2008

A DENSITY VERSION OF VINOGRADOV'S THREE PRIMES THEOREM

HONGZE LI AND HAO PAN

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of all primes. Suppose that P_1, P_2, P_3 are three subsets of $\mathcal{P}$ with $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_1)+\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_2)+\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_3)>2$, where $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_i)$ is the lower density of P_i relative to $\mathcal{P}$. We prove that for every sufficiently large odd integer n, there exist $p_i\in P_i$ such that $n=p_1+p_2+p_3$.

1. Introduction

The ternary Goldbach conjecture says that every odd integer greater than 7 is the sum of three primes. This problem was basically solved by Vinogradov [13] in 1937, and in fact he showed that for every sufficiently large odd integer n,

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1+p_2+p_3=n\\ p_1,p_2,p_3\text{ prime}}}\log p_1\log p_2\log p_3=\frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{S}(n)n^2+O(n^2(\log n)^{-A}),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{S}(n)=\prod_{p\nmid n}(1+(p-1)^{-3})\prod_{p\mid n}(1-(p-1)^{-2})$$

and A is a positive constant. Nowadays Vinogradov's theorem has become a classical result in additive number theory. Later, using a similar method, van der Corput [2] proved that the primes contain infinitely many non-trivial 3-term arithmetic progressions (3AP).

On the other hand, another classical result due to Roth [8] asserts that any subset A of the integers with $\overline{d}(A)>0$ contains infinitely many non-trivial 3APs, where

$$\overline{d}(A)=\limsup_{x\to\infty}\frac{|A\cap[1,x]|}{x}.$$

Roth's theorem is a special case of the well-known Szemerédi theorem [10], which states that any integers set A with $\overline{d}(A)>0$ contains arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11P32; Secondary 11B05, 11P70.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10771135). The second author is the corresponding author.

For two non-empty sets X and A of positive integers, define the upper density and lower density of A relative to X by

$$\overline{d}_X(A) = \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{|A \cap X \cap [1, x]|}{|X \cap [1, x]|}$$

and

$$\underline{d}_X(A) = \liminf_{x\to\infty} \frac{|A \cap X \cap [1, x]|}{|X \cap [1, x]|}.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of all primes. In [4], Green obtained a Roth-type generalization of van der Corput's result. Green showed that if $\mathcal{P}_0$ is a subset of $\mathcal{P}$ with $\overline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}_0) > 0$ then $\mathcal{P}_0$ contains infinitely many 3APs. One major ingredient in Green's proof is a transference principle, which transfers a subset of primes with relative positive density to a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_N = \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ (where N is a large prime) with positive density. Subsequently, this principle was greatly improved (in a different way) in the proof of Green and Tao's celebrated theorem [5] that the primes contain arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions.

The Hardy-Littlewood circle method [12] is commonly applied in Vinogradov's, van der Corput's, Roth's and Green's proofs. In this paper, we shall use Green's idea to extend the Vinogradov theorem as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that P_1, P_2, P_3 are three subsets of $\mathcal{P}$ with*

$$\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_1) + \underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_2) + \underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_3) > 2.$$

Then for every sufficiently large odd integer n, there exist $p_1 \in P_1$, $p_2 \in P_2$ and $p_3 \in P_3$ such that $n = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$.

Notice that the result of Theorem 1.1 is the best possible in the following sense:

Letting $P_1 = P_2 = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \equiv 1 \pmod 3\}$ and $P_3 = \mathcal{P} \setminus \{3\}$, then $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_1) = \underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_2) = 1/2$ and $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_3) = 1$, but $6k + 5 \notin P_1 + P_2 + P_3$ for any integer k.

For a positive integer q, let $\mathbb{Z}_q = \mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_q^* = \{b \in \mathbb{Z}_q : (b, q) = 1\}$. The key of our proof is an addition theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *Let q be a positive integer with $(q, 6) = 1$. Let f_1, f_2, f_3 be three real-valued functions over $\mathbb{Z}_q^*$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, there exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}_q^*$ such that $n = x + y + z$ and*

$$f_1(x) + f_2(y) + f_3(z) \geqslant \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Z}_q^*} (f_1(a) + f_2(a) + f_3(a)),$$

where ϕ is the Euler totient function.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 will be given in Section 2, and we shall prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 3.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let

$$K = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_q^*} (f_1(x) + f_2(x) + f_3(x)).$$

We shall make an induction on the number of prime divisors of q. First, assuming that Theorem 1.2 holds for two co-prime integers q_1 and q_2, we claim that this theorem is also valid for $q = q_1 q_2$. Consider $\mathbb{Z}_q$ as $\mathbb{Z}_{q_1} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{q_2}$ and functions g_1, g_2, g_3 over $\mathbb{Z}_{q_1}^*$ by

$$g_i(a) = \frac{1}{\phi(q_2)} \sum_{b \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_2}^*} f_i((a, b)).$$

Thus for any $n = (n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_1} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{q_2}$, by the induction hypothesis, there exist $x_1, y_1, z_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_1}^*$ such that $n_1 = x_1 + y_1 + z_1$ and

$$g_1(x_1) + g_2(y_1) + g_3(z_1) \geqslant \frac{1}{\phi(q_1)} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_1}^*} (g_1(a) + g_2(a) + g_3(a)) = K,$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{b \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_2}^*} (f_1((x_1, b)) + f_2((y_1, b)) + f_3((z_1, b))) \geqslant \phi(q_2)K.$$

Define functions h_1, h_2, h_3 over $\mathbb{Z}_{q_2}^*$ by

$$h_1(b) = f_1((x_1, b)), \quad h_2(b) = f_2((y_1, b)), \text{ and } h_3(b) = f_3((z_1, b)).$$

Then applying the induction hypothesis again, there exist $x_2, y_2, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_2}^*$ such that $n_2 = x_2 + y_2 + z_2$ and

$$h_1(x_2) + h_2(y_2) + h_3(z_2) \geqslant \frac{1}{\phi(q_2)} \sum_{b \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_2}^*} (h_1(b) + h_2(b) + h_3(b)) \geqslant K.$$

This concludes the proof of our induction.

Thus we only need to prove Theorem 1.2 when q is the power of a prime. Assume that $q = p$ where $p \geqslant 5$ is a prime. Let $S_i = \sum_{a \neq 0} f_i(a)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Clearly $S_1 + S_2 + S_3 = (p-1)K$. Assume on the contrary that there exists some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that for any $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ with $x + y + z = n$,

$$f_1(x) + f_2(y) + f_3(z) < K. \tag{2.1}$$

We firstly consider the case $n = 0$. Observe that

$$\sum_{\substack{x,y,z \neq 0 \\ x+y+z=0}} f_1(x) = \sum_{x \neq 0} f_1(x) \sum_{\substack{y,z \neq 0 \\ y+z=-x}} 1 = \sum_{x \neq 0} f_1(x) \sum_{y \neq 0, -x} 1 = (p-2)S_1.$$

Similarly we have

$$\sum_{\substack{x,y,z\neq 0\\ x+y+z=0}} f_2(y) = (p-2)S_2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{\substack{x,y,z\neq 0\\ x+y+z=0}} f_3(z) = (p-2)S_3.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} S_1+S_2+S_3 =& \frac{1}{p-2}\sum_{\substack{x,y,z\neq 0\\ x+y+z=0}} (f_1(x)+f_2(y)+f_3(z)) \\ <& \frac{K}{p-2}\sum_{\substack{x,y,z\neq 0\\ x+y+z=0}} 1 \\ =&(p-1)K, \end{aligned}$$

which evidently leads to a contradiction as desired.

Now suppose that $n \neq 0$. Then for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{y,z\neq 0\\ y+z=n-x}} (f_2(y)+f_3(z)) = & \sum_{y\neq 0,n-x} (f_2(y)+f_3(n-x-y)) \\ =&(S_2-f_2(n-x))+(S_3-f_3(n-x)), \end{aligned}$$

where we set $f_i(0)=0$. On the other hand, in view of (2.1),

$$\sum_{\substack{y,z\neq 0\\ y+z=n-x}} (f_2(y)+f_3(z)) < (K-f_1(x))|\{(y,z):\ y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_p^*, y+z=n-x\}|.$$

Therefore

$$S_2+S_3 < (p-2)(K-f_1(x)) + f_2(n-x) + f_3(n-x) \tag{2.2}$$

for those $x \neq 0, n$, and

$$S_2+S_3 < (p-1)(K-f_1(n)). \tag{2.3}$$

Recalling that $S_1+S_2+S_3=(p-1)K$, we see that

$$S_1 > K + (p-2)f_1(x) - f_2(n-x) - f_3(n-x)$$

provided that $x \neq 0, n$. Summing the above inequality over all $x \neq 0, n$, we have

$$(p-2)S_1 > (p-2)K + (p-2)(S_1-f_1(n)) - (S_2-f_2(n)) - (S_3-f_3(n)),$$

i.e.,

$$S_2+S_3 > (p-2)K - (p-2)f_1(n) + f_2(n) + f_3(n).$$

Hence it follows from (2.2) that

$$(p-2)f_1(n) - f_2(n) - f_3(n) > (p-2)f_1(x) - f_2(n-x) - f_3(n-x), \tag{2.4}$$

for any $x \neq 0, n$. Symmetrically,

$$(p-2)f_2(n) - f_1(n) - f_3(n) > (p-2)f_2(x) - f_1(n-x) - f_3(n-x) \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$(p-2)f_3(n) - f_1(n) - f_2(n) > (p-2)f_3(x) - f_1(n-x) - f_2(n-x). \tag{2.6}$$

Computing $(p-3) \times (2.4) + (2.5) + (2.6)$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}(p-1)(p-4)f_1(n) >&(p-2)(p-3)f_1(x) - 2f_1(n-x) + (p-2)f_2(x)\\ &- (p-2)f_2(n-x) + (p-2)f_3(x) - (p-2)f_3(n-x).\end{aligned}$$

Summing the above inequality over all $x \neq 0, n$ again, then

$$(p-2)(p-1)(p-4)f_1(n) > ((p-2)(p-3)-2)(S_1 - f_1(n)),$$

i.e., $(p-1)f_1(n) > S_1$. Thus with the help of (2.3), we obtain a contradiction that

$$S_1 + S_2 + S_3 < S_1 + (p-1)(K - f_1(n)) < (p-1)K.$$

Finally, suppose that $q = p^\alpha$ where $\alpha > 1$. Define g_1, g_2, g_3 over $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ by $g_i(x) = p^{1-\alpha} \sum_{a \equiv x \pmod p} f_i(a)$. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$, since Theorem 1.2 holds for p, we know that there exist $x_1, y_1, z_1 \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ such that $n \equiv x_1 + y_1 + z_1 \pmod p$ and

$$g_1(x_1) + g_2(y_1) + g_3(z_1) \geqslant \frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*} (g_1(a) + g_2(a) + g_3(a)) = K.$$

Let $n' = (n - x_1 - y_1 - z_1)/p$, and define h_1, h_2, h_3 over $\mathbb{Z}_{p^{\alpha-1}}$ by

$$h_1(x) = f_1(x_1 + xp),\ h_2(y) = f_2(y_1 + yp) \text{ and } h_3(z) = f_3(z_1 + zp).$$

It is easy to check that

$$\sum_{\substack{x,y,z \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\alpha-1}} \\ x+y+z=n'}} (h_1(x) + h_2(y) + h_3(z)) = p^{\alpha-1} \sum_{b \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\alpha-1}}} (h_1(b) + h_2(b) + h_3(b))$$

and

$$|\{(x,y,z) :\ x,y,z \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\alpha-1}}, x+y+z = n'\}| = p^{2\alpha-2}.$$

And we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{b \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\alpha-1}}} (h_1(b) + h_2(b) + h_3(b)) =& \sum_{b \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\alpha-1}}} (f_1(x_1 + bp) + f_2(y_1 + bp) + f_3(z_1 + bp))\\ =&p^{\alpha-1}(g_1(x_1) + g_2(y_1) + g_3(z_1))\\ \geqslant&p^{\alpha-1}K.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore there must exist $x_2, y_2, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\alpha-1}}$ such that $n' = x_2 + y_2 + z_2$ and

$$f_1(x_1 + x_2p) + f_2(y_1 + y_2p) + f_3(z_1 + z_2p) = h_1(x_2) + h_2(y_2) + h_3(z_2) \geqslant K.$$

The proof is complete. □

Corollary 2.1. *Let q be a positive square-free odd integer. Suppose that*

$$f_1, f_2, f_3 : \ \mathbb{Z}_q^* \ \longrightarrow \ [0,1]$$

satisfy that

$$\sum_{a\in\mathbb{Z}_q^*}(f_1(a)+f_2(a)+f_3(a)) > 2\phi(q).$$

Then for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, there exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}_q^*$ such that $n = x + y + z$, $f_1(x) + f_2(y) + f_3(z) > 5/3$ and $f_1(x)f_2(y)f_3(z) \neq 0$.

Proof. In view of Theorem 1.2, there is nothing to do if $3 \nmid q$. The case $q = 3$ can be verified directly. For example, supposing that $n = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\{f_1(1)+f_2(1)+f_3(2), f_1(1)+f_2(2)+f_3(1), f_1(2)+f_2(1)+f_3(1)\}\\
\geqslant&\frac{1}{3}(2f_1(1)+2f_2(1)+2f_3(1)+f_1(2)+f_2(2)+f_3(2))\\
>&\frac{8}{3}-\frac{1}{3}(f_1(2)+f_2(2)+f_3(2))\\
\geqslant&\frac{5}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

And if $f_1(1) = 0$ (resp. $f_1(2) = 0$), then $f_1(2)+f_2(1)+f_3(1)$ (resp. $f_1(1)+f_2(2)+f_3(1)$) is greater than $4 - f_2(2) - f_3(2) \geqslant 2$ (resp. $4 - f_2(1) - f_3(2) \geqslant 2$).

Finally, assume that $q = 3q'$ where $3 \nmid q'$. By Theorem 1.2, for any $n = (n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_{q'} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3$ there exist $x_1, y_1, z_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{q'}^*$ such that $n_1 = x_1 + y_1 + z_1$ and

$$\sum_{b\in\mathbb{Z}_3^*}(f_1((x_1,b))+f_2((y_1,b))+f_3((z_1,b))) > 2\phi(3).$$

It follows that there exist $x_2, y_2, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_3^*$ such that $n_2 = x_2 + y_2 + z_2$,

$$f_1((x_1,x_2))+f_2((y_1,y_2))+f_3((z_1,z_2)) > \frac{5}{3}$$

and

$$f_1((x_1,x_2))f_2((y_1,y_2))f_3((z_1,z_2)) \neq 0.$$

□

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 will follow that of Green in [4], only with some slight modifications. Let

$$\kappa = 10^{-4}(\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_1)+\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_2)+\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_3)-2),$$

and let $\alpha_i = \underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_i)/(1+2\kappa)$. We may assume that n is sufficiently large so that

$$|P_i\cap[1,2n/3]| \geqslant (1+\kappa)\alpha_i\frac{2n/3}{\log n}.$$

Let $w = w(n)$ be a function tending sufficiently slowly to infinity with n (e.g., we may choose $w(n) = \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \log\log n \rfloor$), and let

$$W = \prod_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P} \\ p \leqslant w(n)}} p.$$

Clearly $W \leqslant \log n$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{x \leqslant 2n/3 \\ (x,W)=1}} \mathbf{1}_{P_i}(x) \log x \geqslant & \sum_{n^{\frac{1}{1+\kappa/2}} \leqslant x \leqslant 2n/3} \mathbf{1}_{P_i}(x) \log x \\ \geqslant & \frac{\log n}{1+\kappa/2} \bigg(\frac{(1+\kappa)\alpha_i (2n/3)}{\log n} - n^{\frac{1}{1+\kappa/2}} \bigg) \\ \geqslant & \frac{2}{3} \alpha_i n,\end{aligned}$$

whenever n is sufficiently large, where we set $\mathbf{1}_A(x) = 1$ if $x \in A$ and 0 otherwise. Define

$$f_i(b) = \max \bigg\{ 0, \frac{3\phi(W)}{2n} \sum_{\substack{x \leqslant 2n/3 \\ x \equiv b \pmod{W}}} \mathbf{1}_{P_i}(x) \log x - 3\kappa \bigg\}$$

for $b \in \mathbb{Z}_W^*$. By the well-known Siegel-Walfisz theorem (cf. [3]), we know that $f_i(b) \in [0, 1]$ if n is sufficiently large. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_{b \in \mathbb{Z}_W^*} (f_1(b) + f_2(b) + f_3(b)) \\ \geqslant & \frac{3\phi(W)}{2n} \sum_{b \in \mathbb{Z}_W^*} \sum_{\substack{x \leqslant 2n/3 \\ x \equiv b \pmod{W}}} (\mathbf{1}_{P_1}(x) + \mathbf{1}_{P_2}(x) + \mathbf{1}_{P_3}(x)) \log x - 9\kappa\phi(W) \\ \geqslant & (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 9\kappa)\phi(W) \\ > & 2\phi(W).\end{aligned}$$

In view of Corollary 2.1, there exist $b_1, b_2, b_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_W^*$ such that $n \equiv b_1 + b_2 + b_3 \pmod{W}$, $f_1(b_1) + f_2(b_2) + f_3(b_3) > 5/3$ and $f_i(b_i) > 0$. And without loss of generality, we may assume that $1 \leqslant b_1, b_2, b_3 < W$.

Let N be a prime in the interval $[(1+\kappa)n/W, (1+2\kappa)n/W]$. Thanks to the prime number theorem, such N always exists for sufficiently large n. Following our discussions above, let $n' = (n - b_1 - b_2 - b_3)/W$ and let

$$A_i = \{x : Wx + b_i \in P_i \cap [1, 2n/3]\}.$$

It suffices to show that $n' \in A_1 + A_2 + A_3$. Let

$$\alpha_i' = \sum_x \mathbf{1}_{A_i}(x) \lambda_{b_i,W,N}(x),$$

where

$$\lambda_{b,W,N}(x) = \begin{cases} \phi(W)\log(Wx+b)/WN & \text{if } x \leqslant N \text{ and } Wx+b \text{ is prime,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$\alpha_i' = \frac{\phi(W)}{WN}\sum_x \mathbf{1}_{A_i}(x)\log(Wx+b_i) \geqslant \frac{2(f_i(b_i)+3\kappa)}{3(1+2\kappa)},$$

since $A_i \subseteq [0,N]$ and $f_i(b_i) > 0$. Then we have

$$\alpha_1', \alpha_2', \alpha_3' \geqslant \frac{2\kappa}{1+2\kappa} \geqslant \kappa$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1' + \alpha_2' + \alpha_3' \geqslant & \frac{2}{3(1+2\kappa)}(f_1(b_1)+f_2(b_2)+f_3(b_3)+9\kappa) \\ \geqslant & \frac{10}{9} + 3\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Below we consider A_1, A_2, A_3 as the subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_N$. Since $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subseteq [0, 2n/3W]$ and $N \geqslant n/W + 3$, there exist no $x_i \in A_i$ such that $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = n' + N$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. Therefore $n' \in A_1 + A_2 + A_3$ in $\mathbb{Z}_N$ implies that $n' \in A_1 + A_2 + A_3$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $\mu_i(x) = \lambda_{b_i,W,N}(x)$ and $a_i(x) = \mathbf{1}_{A_i}(x)\mu_i(x)$. For an arbitrary complex-valued function f over $\mathbb{Z}_N$, define $\tilde{f}$ over $\mathbb{Z}_N$ by

$$\tilde{f}(r) = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_N} f(x)e(-xr/N),$$

where $e(x) = e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}x}$. Also, for functions f, g over $\mathbb{Z}_N$, define

$$(f * g)(x) = \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}_N} f(y)g(x-y).$$

It is easy to check that $(f * g)\tilde{} = \tilde{f}\tilde{g}$. Suppose that $\delta, \epsilon > 0$ are two real numbers which will be chosen later. Let

$$R_i = \{r \in \mathbb{Z}_N : |\tilde{a}_i(r)| \geqslant \delta\}$$

and

$$B_i = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N : \|xr/N\| \leqslant \epsilon \text{ for all } r \in R_i\},$$

where $\|x\| = \min_{z\in\mathbb{Z}} |x - z|$. Also let $\beta_i = \mathbf{1}_{B_i}/|B_i|$ and $a_i' = a_i * \beta_i * \beta_i$.

Lemma 3.1.

$$\left|\sum_{\substack{x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_N \\ x+y+z=n'}} a_1'(x)a_2'(y)a_3'(z) - \sum_{\substack{x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_N \\ x+y+z=n'}} a_1(x)a_2(y)a_3(z)\right| \leqslant \frac{C_1}{N}(\epsilon^2\delta^{-5/2} + \delta^{1/4}).$$

Proof. It is not difficult to see that

$$\sum_{\substack{x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_N\\ x+y+z=n'}} a_1(x)a_2(y)a_3(z) = N^{-1}\sum_{r\in\mathbb{Z}_N} e(n'r/N)\tilde{a_1}(r)\tilde{a_2}(r)\tilde{a_3}(r).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\Bigg|\sum_{\substack{x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_N\\ x+y+z=n'}} a_1'(x)a_2'(y)a_3'(z) - \sum_{\substack{x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_N\\ x+y+z=n'}} a_1(x)a_2(y)a_3(z)\Bigg|\\ =&N^{-1}\Bigg|\sum_{r\in\mathbb{Z}_N} e(n'r/N)\tilde{a_1}(r)\tilde{a_2}(r)\tilde{a_3}(r)(1-\tilde{\beta_1}^2(r)\tilde{\beta_2}^2(r)\tilde{\beta_3}^2(r))\Bigg|.\end{aligned}$$

From the proofs of Lemma 6.7 and Proposition 6.4 in [4], we know that $|R_i| \leqslant C_1'\delta^{-5/2}$ for some absolute constant C_1', and if $r \in R = R_1 \cap R_2 \cap R_3$, then

$$|1-\tilde{\beta_1}^2(r)\tilde{\beta_2}^2(r)\tilde{\beta_3}^2(r)| \leqslant 2^{12}\epsilon^2.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\Bigg|\sum_{r\in R} e(n'r/N)\tilde{a_1}(r)\tilde{a_2}(r)\tilde{a_3}(r)(1-\tilde{\beta_1}^2(r)\tilde{\beta_2}^2(r)\tilde{\beta_3}^2(r))\Bigg|\\ \leqslant&2^{12}\epsilon^2\sum_{r\in R}\Bigg|e(n'r/N)\tilde{a_1}(r)\tilde{a_2}(r)\tilde{a_3}(r)\Bigg|\\ \leqslant&2^{12}\epsilon^2|R|\\ \leqslant&2^{12}C_1'\epsilon^2\delta^{-5/2}\end{aligned}$$

by noting that $|\tilde{a}_i(r)| \leqslant \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_N} a_i(x) \leqslant 1$. And since $|\tilde{\beta}_i(r)| \leqslant \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_N}\beta_i(x) = 1$, with the help of the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Bigg|\sum_{r\notin R} e(n'r/N)\tilde{a_1}(r)\tilde{a_2}(r)\tilde{a_3}(r)(1-\tilde{\beta_1}^2(r)\tilde{\beta_2}^2(r)\tilde{\beta_3}^2(r))\Bigg|\\ \leqslant&2\sup_{r\notin R}|\tilde{a_1}(r)\tilde{a_2}(r)\tilde{a_3}(r)|^{1/4}\sum_{r\notin R}|\tilde{a_1}(r)|^{3/4}|\tilde{a_2}(r)|^{3/4}|\tilde{a_3}(r)|^{3/4}\\ \leqslant&2\delta^{1/4}\Bigg(\sum_{r\notin R}|\tilde{a_1}(r)|^{9/4}\Bigg)^{1/3}\Bigg(\sum_{r\notin R}|\tilde{a_2}(r)|^{9/4}\Bigg)^{1/3}\Bigg(\sum_{r\notin R}|\tilde{a_3}(r)|^{9/4}\Bigg)^{1/3}\\ \leqslant&C_1''\delta^{1/4},\end{aligned}$$

where we apply Lemma 6.6 in [4] with $p = 9/4$. This concludes our proof. □

Now we shall give a lower bound only depending on κ for $\sum_{x+y+z=n'} a_1'(x)a_2'(y)a_3'(z)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that* $\epsilon^{|R_i|} \geqslant C \log\log w/w$. *Then for each* $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N$

$$|a_i'(x)| \leqslant (1 + 2C^{-1})/N.$$

Proof. The proof is same as Lemma 6.3 in [4], so we omit the details here. □

In [11], Varnavides showed that if A is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_N$ with $|A| \geqslant \theta N$, then A contains at least $c(\theta)N^2$ non-trivial 3APs whenever N is sufficiently large, where $c(\theta)$ is a constant only depending on θ. Varnavides' argument was used by Green in the proof of his Lemma 6.8 [4]. Here we also need an analogue of Varnavides' result for sumsets. For non-empty subsets $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_k$ of $\mathbb{Z}_N$, define

$$\nu_{X_1,X_2,\ldots,X_k}(n) = |\{(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k) : x_i \in X_i, n = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k\}|.$$

In particular, we set $\nu_{X_1}(n) = \mathbf{1}_{X_1}(n)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that* $k \geqslant 2$ *and* $0 < \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k \leqslant 1$ *with* $\theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_k > 1$. *Let*

$$\theta = \min\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k, (\theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_k - 1)/(3k - 5)\}.$$

Suppose that N *is a prime greater than* $2\theta^{-2}$, *and* $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ *are subsets of* $\mathbb{Z}_N$ *with* $|X_i| \geqslant \theta_i N$. *Then for any* $n \in \mathbb{Z}_N$, *we have* $\nu_{X_1,X_2,\ldots,X_k}(n) \geqslant \theta^{2k-3}N^{k-1}$.

Proof. When $k = 2$, we have

$$\nu_{X_1,X_2}(n) = |X_1 \cap (n - X_2)| \geq |X_1| + |X_2| - |X_1 \cup (n - X_2)| \geq |X_1| + |X_2| - N.$$

Below we assume that $k \geqslant 3$ and the assertion holds for the smaller values of k.

Suppose that A, B are two non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_N$. Let

$$S_t(A, B) = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N : \nu_{A,B}(x) \geqslant t\}.$$

A result of Pollard [7, 6] asserts that for any $1 \leqslant t \leqslant \min\{|A|, |B|\}$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t} |S_i(A, B)| \geqslant \min\{tN, t(|A| + |B| - t)\}.$$

(The case $t = 1$ is the well-known Cauchy-Davenport theorem.)

Without loss of generality, we suppose that $\theta_1 \geqslant \theta_2 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant \theta_k$. If $\theta_1 + \theta_2 > 1 + \theta$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{X_1,X_2,\ldots,X_k}(n) =& \sum_{x \in X_3 + \cdots + X_k} \nu_{X_1,X_2}(n - x)\nu_{X_3,\cdots,X_k}(x) \\
\geqslant& (|X_1| + |X_2| - N) \sum_{x \in X_3 + \cdots + X_k} \nu_{X_3,\cdots,X_k}(x) \\
=& (|X_1| + |X_2| - N)|X_3| \cdots |X_k| \\
\\
\geqslant& (\theta_1 + \theta_2 - 1)\theta_3 \cdots \theta_k N^{k-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we may assume that $\theta_1 + \theta_2 \leqslant 1 + \theta$. Let $\lceil t \rceil = \min\{n : n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq t\}$, by Pollard's theorem, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \theta N \rceil} |S_i(X_1, X_2)| \geqslant \lceil \theta N \rceil \left(\theta_1 N + \theta_2 N - \lceil \theta N \rceil\right).$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{i=\lceil \theta^2 N \rceil}^{\lceil \theta N \rceil} |S_i(X_1, X_2)| \geqslant \lceil \theta N \rceil \left(\theta_1 N + \theta_2 N - \lceil \theta N \rceil\right) - \left\lceil \theta^2 N \right\rceil N.$$

Hence by noting that

$$\frac{\lceil \theta N \rceil}{N} + \frac{\lceil \theta^2 N \rceil}{\lceil \theta N \rceil} \leqslant 2\theta + \frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{\theta N} \leqslant 3\theta,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{\lceil \theta^2 N \rceil}(X_1, X_2)| \geqslant & \frac{\lceil \theta N \rceil \left(\theta_1 N + \theta_2 N - \lceil \theta N \rceil\right) - \lceil \theta^2 N \rceil N}{\lceil \theta N \rceil - \lceil \theta^2 N \rceil + 1} \\ \geqslant & \theta_1 N + \theta_2 N - 3\theta N. \end{aligned}$$

Let $Y = S_{\lceil \theta^2 N \rceil}(X_1, X_2)$. Clearly $|Y| \geqslant \theta N$ since

$$\theta \leqslant \frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_k - 1}{3k - 5} \leqslant \frac{k-1}{2(3k-5)}(\theta_1 + \theta_2).$$

Then by the induction hypothesis on k,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_k}(n) \geqslant & \sum_{x \in Y} \nu_{X_1, X_2}(x) \nu_{X_3, \ldots, X_k}(n - x) \\ \geqslant & \inf_{x \in Y} \nu_{X_1, X_2}(x) \sum_{x \in Y} \nu_{X_3, \ldots, X_k}(n - x) \\ = & \nu_{Y, X_3, \ldots, X_k}(n) \inf_{x \in Y} \nu_{X_1, X_2}(x) \\ \geqslant & \theta_*^{2k-5} N^{k-2} \theta^2 N, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\theta_* = \min\{\theta_1 + \theta_2 - 3\theta, \theta_3, \ldots, \theta_k, (\theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_k - 3\theta - 1)/(3k - 8)\} \geqslant \theta.$$

□

Lemma 3.4.

$$\sum_{\substack{x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}_N \\ x + y + z = n'}} a_1'(x) a_2'(y) a_3'(z) \geqslant \frac{\kappa^9}{8N}.$$

Proof. Let $A_i' = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N : a_i'(x) \geqslant \alpha_i'\kappa/N\}$. Applying Lemma 3.2 with $C = 2/\kappa$, we have

$$\alpha_i' = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_N} a_i(x) = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_N} a_i'(x) \leqslant \frac{1+\kappa}{N}|A_i'| + \frac{\alpha_i'\kappa}{N}(N - |A_i'|),$$

whence

$$|A_i'| \geqslant \frac{\alpha_i'(1-\kappa)}{1+\kappa}N.$$

Observe that $\alpha_i'(1-\kappa)/(1+\kappa) \geqslant \kappa/2$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\alpha_i'(1-\kappa)}{1+\kappa} = \frac{1-\kappa}{1+\kappa}(\alpha_1' + \alpha_2' + \alpha_3') \geqslant \frac{10}{9} + \frac{\kappa}{2}.$$

Then with the help of Lemma 3.3,

$$\nu_{A_1',A_2',A_3'}(n') \geqslant \frac{\kappa^3}{8}N^2.$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{\substack{x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_N\\ x+y+z=n'}} a_1'(x)a_2'(y)a_3'(z) \geqslant \sum_{\substack{x\in A_1',y\in A_2',z\in A_3'\\ x+y+z=n'}} a_1'(x)a_2'(y)a_3'(z) \geqslant \frac{\kappa^6}{8}\alpha_1'\alpha_2'\alpha_3'N^{-1}.$$

□

Now combining Lemmas 3.1 and 3.4, we obtain that

$$N\sum_{\substack{x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_N\\ x+y+z=n'}} a_1(x)a_2(y)a_3(z) + C_1(\epsilon^2\delta^{-5/2} + \delta^{1/4}) \geqslant \frac{\kappa^9}{8}.$$

By the final arguments in [4], we know that under the condition in Lemma 3.1, we may choose δ and ϵ such that both $\epsilon^2\delta^{-5/2}$ and $\delta^{1/4}$ tend to 0, whenever N is sufficiently large. Thus for sufficiently large n,

$$N\sum_{x+y+z=n'} a_1(x)a_2(y)a_3(z) \geqslant \frac{\kappa^9}{9} > 0.$$

□

4. Further Remarks

Maybe the most famous unsolved conjecture in number theory is the binary Goldbach problem, which says that every even integer greater than 2 is the sum of two primes. The well-known result of Chen [1] asserts that every sufficiently large even integer can be represented as the sum of a prime and an integer which is a prime or the product of two primes. However, it seems that a similar extension of above result will fail for the binary Goldbach conjecture. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently large w such that

$$\prod_{\substack{p \text{ prime} \\ 3 \le p \le w}} \left(\frac{p-2}{p-1} \right) < \epsilon.$$

Let $P_1 = \mathcal{P} \cap (w, \infty)$ and

$$P_2 = \{x \in \mathcal{P} : \, x \equiv 1 \pmod{p} \text{ for an odd prime } p \le w\}.$$

Clearly

$$\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_1) + \underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_2) = 1 + 1 - \prod_{\substack{p \text{ prime} \\ 3 \le p \le w}} \left(\frac{p-2}{p-1} \right) > 2 - \epsilon.$$

But $Wk + 1 \notin P_1 + P_2$ for each odd integers k, where

$$W = \prod_{\substack{p \text{ prime} \\ 3 \le p \le w}} p.$$

In fact, we can construct two sets P_1, P_2 of primes with $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_1) = \underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_2) = 1$ such that there exist infinitely many positive even integers not contained in $P_1 + P_2$. Let $N_k = 2\lfloor e^{k\sqrt{\log k}} \rfloor$ and $n_k = N_{k+1} + N_k + 2$. Let $\mathcal{A}_k = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \, n_k - p \in \mathcal{P}\}$ and

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \, N_k + 2N_{k-1} \leqslant p \leqslant N_{k+1}, n_k - p \notin \mathcal{P}\}.$$

Set $P_1 = P_2 = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}_k$. With the help of Selberg's sieve method, we know that

$$|\mathcal{A}_k| \ll \frac{n_k}{(\log n_k)^2} \prod_{\substack{p \text{ prime} \\ p \mid n_k}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p} \right).$$

Define $z(n) = \max\{z \in \mathbb{N} : \, \prod_{\substack{p \text{ prime} \\ p \leqslant z}} p \leqslant n\}$. By the prime number theorem, $z(n) \ll \log n$. Hence by the Mertens theorem,

$$\prod_{\substack{p \text{ prime} \\ p \mid n}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p} \right) \leqslant \prod_{\substack{p \text{ prime} \\ p \leqslant z(n)}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p} \right) \ll \log\log n.$$

So $|\mathcal{A}_k| \ll N_{k+1} \log\log N_{k+1} / (\log N_{k+1})^2$. It is not difficult to verify that

$$\frac{N_k}{\log N_k} = o\left(\frac{N_{k+1}}{\log N_{k+1}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{N_{k+1} (\log\log N_{k+1})^2}{(\log N_{k+1})^2} = o\left(\frac{N_k}{\log N_k} \right).$$

So by the prime number theorem, for $x \in (N_k, N_k + 2N_{k-1})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}|P_1 \cap [1,x]| \geqslant & |\mathcal{B}_{k-1}| \geqslant |\mathcal{P} \cap [N_{k-1} + 2N_{k-2}, N_k]| - |\mathcal{A}_{k-1}| \\ \geqslant & (1+o(1))\left(\frac{N_k}{\log N_k} - \frac{N_{k-1}+2N_{k-2}}{\log(N_{k-1}+2N_{k-2})}\right) - o\left(\frac{N_k}{\log N_k}\right) \\ = & (1+o(1))\frac{x}{\log x}.\end{aligned}$$

And for $x \in [N_k + 2N_{k-1}, N_{k+1}]$,

$$\begin{aligned}|P_1 \cap [1,x]| \geqslant & |\mathcal{B}_k \cap [1,x]| + |\mathcal{B}_{k-1}| \\ \geqslant & |\mathcal{P} \cap [N_k + 2N_{k-1}, x]| - |\mathcal{A}_k| + |\mathcal{B}_{k-1}| \\ \geqslant & (1+o(1))\left(\frac{x}{\log x} - \frac{N_k + 2N_{k-1}}{\log(N_k + 2N_{k-1})} + \frac{N_k}{\log N_k}\right) \\ = & (1+o(1))\frac{x}{\log x}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_1) = \underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_2) = 1$. But now $n_k \notin P_1 + P_2$, since

$$n_k \notin \left(\bigcup_{j \neq k} [N_j + 2N_{j-1}, N_{j+1}]\right) + \left(\bigcup_{j} [N_j + 2N_{j-1}, N_{j+1}]\right)$$

and $n_k \notin \mathcal{B}_k + \mathcal{B}_k$.

Moreover, we mention that $\underline{d}$ can't be replaced by $\overline{d}$ in Theorem 1.1. Let $N_k = 2\lfloor e^{k\sqrt{\log k}} \rfloor$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \{n : 2 \mid n, N_{k+1} + N_k + 2 \leqslant n \leqslant N_{k+1} + N_k + 2\lfloor \log\log N_{k+1} \rfloor\}.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : n - p \in \mathcal{P} \text{ for some } n \in \mathcal{A}_k\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_k = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : N_k + 2N_{k-1} \leqslant p \leqslant N_{k+1}, n - p \notin \mathcal{P} \text{ for every } n \in \mathcal{A}_k\}.$$

Then

$$|\mathcal{B}_k| = O\left(\frac{N_{k+1}(\log\log N_{k+1})^2}{(\log N_{k+1})^2}\right) = o\left(\frac{N_k}{\log N_k}\right).$$

Let $P_1 = P_2 = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_k$. Similarly as above, we also have $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_1) = \underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_2) = 1$ and $n \notin P_1 + P_2$ for any $n \in \mathcal{A}_k$. Let $M_1 = 2$ and $M_{l+1} = e^{e^{M_l}}$. Let

$$P_3 = \mathcal{P} \cap \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [M_{3l}, M_{3l+1}]\right).$$

Evidently $\overline{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(P_3) = 1$. And for sufficiently large l, there always exists k such that $M_{3l+2} < N_{k+1} < M_{3l+3}/2$. Let $n_k = N_{k+1} + N_k + 2\lfloor \log\log N_{k+1} \rfloor - 1$. Assume that $n_k = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$ where $p_i \in P_i$. Then we must have $p_3 \leqslant M_{3l+1}$ since $n_k \leqslant 2N_{k+1} <$

M_{3l+3}. Hence $n_k - p_3 \in \mathcal{A}_k$ by noting $M_{3l+1} \leqslant \log\log M_{3l+2} < \log\log N_{k+1}$. This leads to a contradiction since $\mathcal{A}_k \cap (P_1 + P_2) = \emptyset$.

References

[1] J.-R. Chen, *On the representation of a large even integer as the sum of a prime and a product of at most two primes*, Sci. Sinica, **16**(1973), 157-176.

[2] J. G. van der Corput, *Über Summen von Primzahlen und Primzahlquadraten*, Math. Ann., **116**(1939), 1-50.

[3] H. Davenport, *Multiplicative Number Theory*, Third edition, *Grad. Texts Math.* **74**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.

[4] B. Green, *Roth's theorem in the primes*, Ann. Math., **161**(2005), 1609-1636.

[5] B. Green and T. Tao, *The primes contain arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions*, Ann. Math., **167**(2008), 481-457.

[6] M. B. Nathanson, *Additive Number Theory: Inverse Problems and the Geometry of Sumsets*, *Grad. Texts Math.* **165**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[7] J. M. Pollard, *A generalization of the theorem of Cauchy and Davenport*, J. London Math. Soc., **8**(1974), 460-462.

[8] K. F. Roth, *On certain sets of integers*, J. London Math. Soc., **28**(1953), 245-252.

[9] A. Sárközy, *On difference sets of sequences on integers III*, Acta Math. Sci. Hungar., **31**(1978), 355-386.

[10] E. Szemerédi, *On sets of integers containing no k elements in arithmetic progression*, Acta Arith., **27**(1975), 299-345.

[11] P. Varnavides, *On certain sets of positive density*, J. London Math. Soc., **34**(1959), 358-360.

[12] R. C. Vaughan, *The Hardy-Littlewood Method*, Second edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[13] I. M. Vinogradov, *The representation of an odd number as a sum of three primes*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR., **16**(1937), 139-142.

E-mail address: `lihz@sjtu.edu.cn`

Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai 200240, People's Republic of China

E-mail address: `haopan79@yahoo.com.cn`

Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, People's Republic of China